members should be frank and independent in their criticism of Government. If appointment is to be made from the Legislative Council to the Executive Council is it in the interests of frankness and independence of criticism on the part of members? The general question apart, is this sound policy?

Mr. Subba Rao.—The principle that in the interest of frankness and independence such appointment should not be made is generally correct, but in British India Judges of High Courts have sometimes been taken to the Executive Council in spite of it, and no great harm has come. I propose appointment from the Legislative Council simply because Government said last year that no appointment can be made from the Representative Assembly.

Mr. M. Subbiah.—The most important institution in the State is the Representative Assembly. The Executive Council is only to execute the policy approved by His Highness. We may therefore ask for more powers to the Representative Assembly than ask for these favours. Besides, non-official members in the service of Government change their opinions. There is no use therefore of a member being on the Executive Council. He would not represent the people. The Government with or without a non-official member is always the same. We do not want this privilege. We would rather have more powers for the Assembly.

Mr. Abbas Khan.—The non-official may be an honorary member of the Executive Council. Only those who can do honorary work should be taken. The power of electing the member may be given to the Representative Assembly.

Dewan.—This is an effective reply to my question.

Mr. Krishna Sastri.—A non-official should be on the Executive Council. The member should be elected from the Representative Assembly and not from the Legislative Council. A beginning was made in 1889 when there was an Advisory Council during the time of Messrs. Chentsal Rao and Krishna Rao, etc. A capable member from the Representative Assembly should be elected.

Dewan.—The suggestion, as it stands, is not practicable. The general feeling, however, I will submit to His Highness.

SUBJECT No. 50.

Right of private persons to sue Government servants.

Mr. Gurulinja Wodeyar, Devanhalli Taluk.

Dewan.—The matter is under consideration in the Legislative Department.

Mr. Krishna Sastri.—It has been under consideration very long.

Mr. B. Narasinga Rao.—Shall we take the reply of Government to be that a draft bill is under preparation?

Dewan.—Information is being collected with a view to draft a bill.

SUBJECT No. 51.

(1) Exemption of the Malnad people from the operations of the Arms Regulation.

Mr. Eregowda, South Mysore Native Planters' Association.

(2) Grant of exemption from Arms Act to raiyats paying large kandayam.

Messrs. Mir Mahomed Sab, Tarikere Taluk, and SyedKhaja Peeran, Muslim Association, Tarikere.

Mr. Mohamed Sab.—With a view to protect their property it is desirable to exempt the people of the Malnad from the operation of the Arms Regulation.

He said that though frequent reminders were issued for the renewal of the licenses reply was not received.

Mr. Ananthiah.—Though applications are made repeatedly, they are being held up in the Police Department, when sent for report. If a man keeps any arms without a license, the police officers at once arrest him.

Dewan.—Whole sale exemption is not possible. Orders will issue simplifying procedure for the grant of licenses and requiring that applications for renewals should be dealt with without further enquiry and first applications disposed of with the least possible delay.

Mr. C. Rasool Khan.—Those who pay a kandayam of more than Rs. 30 annually should be given a license. Others should not be given.

SUBJECT No. 52.

Legislation against cattle lifting.

Messrs. B. Kesaviah, Chikmagalur Taluk, and Thippiah, Challakere Taluk.

Necessary legislation may be passed immediately to prevent cattle lifting by wicked people for the sake of hides, placing the trade under proper control and requiring the hides to be punched before sale.

SUBJECT No. 53.

Exclusion of women from the operation of Act XIII of 1859.

Mr. Srinivasa Rao, Chikmagalur Taluk.

The Dewan said that the matter had already been considered and a draft bill was under the consideration of Government.

Reply of Government.—The bill is under preparation.

SUBJECT No. 54.

Repeal of the Insolvency Regulation.

Messrs. Padmanna, Chandrasekhariah and K. Venkatasamiah, Nanjangud Taluk.

Mr. K. Venkatasamiah.—There is considerable difference between the old and the new Insolvency Regulation. The old Regulation was better, but the new Regulation has been passed without the opinions of the Bar Associations and of the Judges being obtained, and we have to make the best of it. I shall give a list of the points in which modification is necessary. Action may be taken to have the regulation modified. The best thing would be to revive the old regulation. If that was not possible, the new one may be modified.

Mr. C. S. Doraswami Iyer.—Where is there anything like the old Regulation?

Mr. Venkatasamiah.—I mean the portion of the Civil Procedure Code relating to this matter.

Mr. C. Subba Rao.—The Regulation makes no provision for the appointment of an Official Receiver.